

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Claims 1 through 15 are pending in the application.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by newly cited Japanese patent JP 63086309 A (herein JP).

JP discloses a dielectric composition comprising 70-5 vol.% of a dielectric ceramic material and 30-95 vol.% of an organic polymer material. The dielectric composition is formed by mixing powders of the ceramic dielectric material and the polymer, forming the mixture and sintering the formed mixture. See the first full paragraph on page 5 of the English translation.

In contrast, Applicant forms the dielectric compound by mixing powders of the dielectric ceramic material and a monomer (unpolymerized form) of the polymer material, followed by forming and polymerizing. See for example, page 4, line 22 et seq. of Applicant's Specification.

In view of these differences, claim 11 has been amended to specify that the dielectric compound is manufactured by mixing powders of the dielectric ceramic material and a monomer of the polymer, followed by forming the mixture into a mass, and polymerizing the monomer in the mass.

On page 1 of the English translation of JP, claim 2 states that the 'organic high polymer material is a monomer or copolymer of ethylene tetrafluoride. This is obviously a translational error, as shown by the first full sentence at the top of page 5 of the translation, which reads: 'Of these organic high polymer materials, a **monopolymer** of ethylene

tetrafluoride is particularly preferable ...' (emphasis added). Such a monopolymer or single polymer is to be distinguished from a copolymer. See the statement at the bottom of page 4 of the translation, which reads: 'As to the organic high polymer material, ethylene tetra fluoride having a low dielectric loss, **single polymer** of polyethylene or polyolefin, or **copolymer** of ethylene tetrafluoride ...' (emphasis added).

Moreover, the term 'monomer' occurs only once, while the term 'polymer' occurs frequently and consistently elsewhere in the translation document.

Thus, the term 'monomer' in claim 2 of the translation was an obvious erroneous translation of the term 'monopolymer' on page 5 of the translation.

Since JP does not teach or suggest mixing a powder of a monomer with a powder of a dielectric ceramic, followed by polymerization of the monomer, it is urged that the rejection of claim 11 is in error and should be withdrawn.

New dependent claim 14 has been added to specify that the quantity m of monomer used in the method of claim 11 lies between 3% by weight $\leq m \leq$ 20% by weight in relation to the quantity of dielectric ceramic material used.

Claims 1-10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of JP.

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to specify that the electronic component and the dielectric compound are manufactured by the method of claim 7.

New dependent claims 13 and 15 have been added to specify that the quantity m of monomer used in the methods of claims 1 and 12 lies between 3% by weight $\leq m \leq$ 20% by weight in relation to the quantity of dielectric ceramic material used.

As stated in previous responses, and as acknowledged by the Examiner, Hansen fails to teach or suggest forming a composite dielectric by mixing powders of a ceramic and an organic material.

As stated above with respect to the rejection of claim 11, JP does not disclose the method of forming a composite by mixing powders of a ceramic material and a monomer, and subsequently polymerizing the monomer in the mixture. On the contrary, JP clearly teaches forming a mixture of a ceramic powder and a **polymer** powder, and accordingly teaches away from Applicant's invention as now claimed.

Accordingly, claims 1-15 are not obvious in view of the combination of Hansen and JP, and the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
203-329-6584